



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,154	04/22/2004	Takashi Aketa	0171-1087PUS1	5733
2292 7590 02/14/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER FISCHER, JUSTIN R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/14/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Continuation of 11: Applicant argues that Fujiki and Tsuji merely disclose alumina (aluminum oxide), while the claimed invention requires alumina hydroxide. However, the disclosures by Fujiki and Tsuji are exemplary (as evidenced by the language "such as"). It is further noted that inorganic fillers are conventionally described as including both metal oxides and metal hydroxides. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to use aluminum oxide or aluminum hydroxide in the adhesive compositions of either Fujiki or Tsuji in view of the general disclosures of the respective references. It is emphasized that inorganic fillers are conventionally described as including both metal oxides and metal hydroxides and thus, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the disclosures of Fujiki and Tsuji as including oxides and hydroxides. Shimizu and Takumaru disclose extremely similar adhesive compositions (as compared to Fujiki and Tsuji) comprising aluminum hydroxide, evidencing the known use of such an inorganic filler. Ichikawa (US 6,501,495- Column 10, Lines 23-33) and Murakami (US 6,372,339- Column 6, Lines 25-35) are additionally cited to expressly evidence the use of metal oxides and metal hydroxides as equivalent alternatives in adhesive applications. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the disclosures of Fujiki and Tsuji as being directed to metal oxides and metal hydroxides, there being no conclusive showing of unexpected results.

Applicant additionally contends that the present invention exhibits unexpected, advantageous properties. However, Table 1 does not provide a conclusive showing of unexpected results. In particular, Examples 1-5 include different amounts of aluminum

Art Unit: 1791

hydroxide powder and different amounts of fumed silica, as compared to Comparative Example 2. Thus, it is unclear if any realized benefits are a result of the specific combination of inorganic fillers and/or the specific amounts of inorganic fillers (individual amounts or total amounts). For example, it is unclear if any benefits would be realized if Comparative Example 2 included the same amount of total inorganic filler (56 phr) as Example 1. This rationale is equally applicable to Comparative Example 1. It is further noted that additional experiments using different combinations of inorganic fillers (e.g. silica and aluminum oxide) might provide a conclusive showing of unexpected results for the claimed combination (as defined in independent claim 1).

/Justin R Fischer/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791